



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,773	10/30/2000	Tara Lynn Alvarez	2-4-3	7026
46290	7590	08/01/2006	EXAMINER	
WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON 10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100 HOUSTON, TX 77042				SHAH, CHIRAG G
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/699,773

Applicant(s)

ALVAREZ ET AL.

Examiner

Chirag G. Shah

Art Unit

2616

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: 4-11.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3 and 12-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____


CHIRAG SHAH
 PATENT EXAMINER, 2016

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: After the prosecution on the merit is closed, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 16-18 to incorporate the rejected claim 3 features. The claim 3 features incorporated into claim 1 does not render the claim allowable. Examiner has respectfully presented a rejection under 35 USC 103 (a) for claim 3 as being unpatentable under Gurusami in view of Valencia and further in view of Ellis. Regarding claims 3 and 18, Gurusami discloses in col. 7, lines 40-45 of transmitting delay sensitive packets (telephony) and non-delay sensitive (data) packets over a communications link. Gurusami discloses in col. 6, lines 42-58 that transmission for each device is specified with twelve bytes of payload. Valencia discloses in figure 4 and col. 9, lines 9-31 when the receiver being able to distinguish by monitoring if a latency-sensitive packet such as a UDP voice packet is received or latency-insensitive packet such as data. Based on the latency sensitivity of the packet, default action of transmission with respect to fragmentation or without fragmentation takes place. Gurusami in view of Valencia fails to explicitly disclose a defined length of NDSI (Non-delay sensitive information) being transmitted. Ellis et al teaches of an efficient packet transport system for mixed traffic in which a packet fragmentation protocol allows traffic of different classes to occupy a single physical link. Ellis et al discloses in column 7, lines 54 to column 8, lines 40 that since packets within the broadband network are of fixed or variable length, the delay is based on a defined length such as 16Kbytes of low priority data (data-delay insensitive) being transmitted. Applicant argues that Ellis fails to cure the fundamental deficiencies of Gurusami and Valencia and fails to provide any suggestion or motivation for modifying the cited art to arrive at the Applicant's invention. Examiner respectfully disagrees and redirects Applicant to Ellis reference (US 5,497,371). Ellis discloses in col. 8, lines 13-40 that the delay that a particular packet fragment experiences is based on the packet length divided by the link speed. In order to maintain a reasonable switching delay, the data packet, which are non-delay sensitive information or low priority data has a larger maximum packet size 16Kbytes (which is a defined length of NDSI being transmitted). The motivation is, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Gurusami in view of Valencia to include the delay based on defined length NDSI being transmitted as taught by Ellis et al in order to accurately account for and alter non-sensitive traffic causing delay in a coexisting link to efficiently transport delay sensitive traffic with minimal switching and assembly delays (see Ellis, col. 8, lines 21-31).